

Remarks

Claims 1-5, 8, 11-13 and 22-28 are pending. Claims 14-21 are canceled in this response. All pending claims have been rejected as being obvious over Savoie (6,571,051) in view of Baedle (6842897). Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the detailed remarks made by the Office at pages 9-12 in reply to the prior Response.

The Combination Of Savoie And Baedle Does Not Teach A Server Transmitting An Image Editing Program And A Lower Resolution Proxy Image To A Client

Neither Savoie nor Baedle teach or suggest a server transmitting or a client receiving an image editing program along with a lower resolution proxy of a higher resolution image.

Savoie teaches a conventional video image editing system in which computer 102 is pre-programmed with the image editing program. Video images are supplied to computer 102 through a tape recorder 101. Baedle teaches transmitting programming from a server to a client. The combination of Savoie and Baedle does not teach transmitting an image editing program along with a lower resolution proxy of a higher resolution image.

Conspicuously absent from the Office's remarks is any analysis or showing that the references teach both of these elements – transmitting an image editing program *and* an image proxy. Even if it is assumed, therefore, that the combination is properly motivated, the combination does not teach all claim limitations.


The Combination Of Savoie And Baedle Is Not Properly Motivated

The Office argues it would have been obvious to use the Internet to transmit image editing information between computers instead of using a floppy disk as taught by Savoie simply because Baedle teaches transmitting programming from a server to a client. If this were true, then Baedle would have rendered obvious any and all Internet communications. Of course, Baedle has not rendered obvious any and all Internet communications.

Baedle does not say anything about enhancing edit programs (or any other programming) on a client by linking the client to a plurality of stand-alone systems. The key link is between the server and a client. The fact that there may be multiple clients linked to the server has no relevance to the client running the edit program. That is to say, there is nothing about linking multiple stand-alone systems that suggests or motivates combining the stand-alone system of Savoie with a client/server relationship taught by Baedle, even if it is assumed the two references together somehow teach all of the limitations in the claims. The generalized client/server relationship taught by Baedle cannot reasonably be deemed to suggest the specific relationship recited in the claims.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Steven R. Ormiston
Reg. No. 35,974
208.433.1991 x204

October 11, 2005